

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 11 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 11, 2006 has been received and reviewed. This response is directed to that action. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith.

The specification has been amended to bring it into conformity with the claims. No claims have been amended.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "cable" as used in amended claim 2. Accordingly, the specification has been amended in this response to bring the specification into conformity with claim 2, thereby obviating the objection.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §1-2

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-10 and 13-14 as obvious over EP 1233046 in view of JP 2002-101535. In response, the applicants submit that the cited combination does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the present claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that EP 046 does not teach that an adhesive section is applied first to a flat cable, as required by claim 1 of the present invention. The Examiner stated that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand from EP 046 that adhesive sections can be applied first to the flat cable. The applicants must respectfully disagree. The teachings of EP 046 are very generally, indeed, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to apply an adhesive to a flat cable. More likely, such skilled person would interpret EP 046 as favoring applying an adhesive to a substrate first, not to a flat cable. Paragraph 6 of EP 046 explicitly states that the adhesive is applied to a substrate, not a cable.

The Examiner also conceded that JP 535 teaches applying an adhesive to the substrate, not the flat cable. Consequently, because neither reference teaches applying an adhesive to a flat cable before securing the flat cable to a substrate, the cited combination does not teach all of the elements of the present invention. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established.

Claims 2-5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over EP 046 in view of admitted prior art, JP 535 and further in view of DE 2617249 and optionally Hamisch (US 6,138,734).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over EP 046 in view of admitted prior art, JP 535 and further in view of DE 249 and optionally Hamisch (US 6,138,734) and even further in view of Samuelson et al. (US 5,316,613).

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over EP 046 in view of admitted prior art, JP 535 and further in view of DE 2617249 and optionally Hamisch (US 6,138,734) and even further in view of DE 3834602.

Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over EP 046 in view of admitted prior art, JP 535 and further in view of Barck (US 4,126,304).

In response to each of the four previous rejections, applicants point out that the defects in the combination of EP 046, the admitted prior art and JP 535 are discussed above. There is nothing in the other cited references that overcomes these defects, or is even alleged to overcome these defects. Even assuming for arguments sake that the references show the elements or concepts urged by the Examiner, which the applicants do not concede, the Examiner has presented no line of reasoning, and we know of none, as to why the artisan viewing only the collective teachings of the references would have found it obvious to selectively pick and choose various elements and/or concepts from the several references relied upon to arrive at the claimed invention. *Ex Parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972 (PTO Bd App. 1985); *In Re Horn*, 203 USPQ 969 (CCPA 1979). The collection of references supports the inescapable conclusion that the Examiner has pieced the references together to support a rejection on the basis of hindsight. Consequently, none of these combinations makes out a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 11 2006

instant claims. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw each of these rejections as well.

Applicants believe the claims are now in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the resolution of which can be advanced through a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By Mr. Marin

Mark D. Marin

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 50,842

875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor

New York, New York 10022

Phone: (212) 808-0700

Fax: (212) 808-0844